

Who Owns The Dogs?

by Janet Jagan

A lot of people opposed to the PPP/Civic government like to say - forget the past and deal with the present. This attitude includes the local media.

But how can we forget the past when it is repeating itself now? The present spate of terrorism spawned by criminals, politicians and racists is

almost a repeat performance of the sixties. The difference now is that the politically and racist-backed criminals are using machine guns to terrorise Guyanese citizens comprising mainly East Indian and Policemen. In the 60s the target did not include our Policemen, and instead of machine guns, they bombed homes and business places and killed PPP activists.

Basically the reasons behind the terrorism of the 60s and now have been to destabilise a government which the PNC had tried to win in previous elections: then of 1961; now, those of 1992, 1997 and 2001. To my mind there has been not much change in motivation. The PNC wants to rule at all costs. The cost we paid after the UK/USA coalition in 1964 to remove the PPP from

office was 28 years of misrule and four rigged general elections to keep the PNC in office.

The PNC's Reform Leader Stanley Ming said at a PNC press conference on Sept. 26th that Guyana was not faced with the threat of terrorism but with "common and basic crime, some old fashioned and some of recent variety including murder, violent theft, drug-pushing and gang warfare."

Poor befuddled Mr. Ming with his head in the clouds. Would he have said this if he had been at the Kitty liqueur store when the machine guns opened fire or trying to pass through Buxton on Friday when all hell broke loose? Could anyone in their sane mind believe that what is going on is just "common and basic crime"?

The Stabroek News having stoked the fires of ra-

cial and political hate in its columns is now calling to "Save the State." It calls on the PPP/C to approach the PNC/R to "rescue the State." What can the PNC/R do? The same question came up in the terrorism of the 60s. Should the PNC be asked to "Call off the dogs"? The answer then and now, I suspect, is "if we call off the dogs, then we own the dogs." Will they admit ownership?